



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/926,218	01/28/2002	Arne Holmgren	P21480	8453
7055	7590	04/29/2009		
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C. 1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE RESTON, VA 20191			EXAMINER KATAKAM, SUDHAKAR	
			ART UNIT 1621	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 04/29/2009	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com

pto@gbpatent.com

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No. 09/926,218	Applicant(s) HOLMGREN ET AL.
Examiner Sudhakar Katakam	Art Unit 1621

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 24 March 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
 Claim(s) allowed: _____.
 Claim(s) objected to: _____.
 Claim(s) rejected: 13-19 and 26-28.
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
 13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Daniel M Sullivan/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1621

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Engman et al disclosed a method for reduction of a substrate with thioredoxin reductase, comprising combining the thioredoxin reductase, the substrate, selenium compound and NADPH in vitro conditions to reduce the substrate, wherein the substrate is thioredoxin and the selenium compound [see Table 1, page 4601] is a "competitive inhibitor" for the thioredoxin [see Results]. Engman et al also disclose selenium in the form of selenite (selenium compound) is a substrate for the reduction by mammalian thioredoxin reductase [page 4600, 2nd paragraph]. Please note that a competitive inhibitor is also a substrate. A competitive inhibitor competes with the substrate for the same binding site on the enzyme. Therefore, in addition to Engman disclosure [page 4600, 2nd paragraph], the selenium compound disclosed by Engman is a substrate for thioredoxin reductase.

The MPEP 2112 says that INHERENT FEATURE NEED NOT BE RECOGNIZED AT THE TIME OF THE INVENTION. There is no requirement that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the inherent disclosure at the time of invention, but only that the subject matter is in fact inherent in the prior art reference. Schering Corp. v. Geneva Pharm. Inc., 339 F.3d 1373, 1377, 67 USPQ2d 1664, 1668 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (rejecting the contention that inherent anticipation requires recognition by a person of ordinary skill in the art before the critical date and allowing expert testimony with respect to post-critical date clinical trials to show inherency); see also Toro Co. v. Deere & Co., 355 F.3d 1313, 1320, 69 USPQ2d 1584, 1590 (Fed. Cir. 2004) ("[T]he fact that a characteristic is a necessary feature or result of a prior-art embodiment (that is itself sufficiently described and enabled) is enough for inherent anticipation, even if that fact was unknown at the time of the prior invention."); Abbott Labs v. Geneva Pharms., Inc., 182 F.3d 1315, 1319, 51 USPQ2d 1307, 1310 (Fed.Cir.1999) ("If a product that is offered for sale inherently possesses each of the limitations of the claims, then the invention is on sale, whether or not the parties to the transaction recognize that the product possesses the claimed characteristics."); Atlas Powder Co. v. Ireco, Inc., 190 F.3d 1342, 1348-49 (Fed. Cir.1999) ("Because sufficient aeration" was inherent in the prior art, it is irrelevant that the prior art did not recognize the key aspect of [the] invention.... An inherent structure, composition, or function is not necessarily known."); SmithKline Beecham Corp. v. Apotex Corp., 403 F.3d 1331, 1343-44, 74 USPQ2d 1398, 1406-07 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (holding that a prior art patent to an anhydrous form of a compound "inherently" anticipated the claimed hemihydrate form of the compound because practicing the process in the prior art to manufacture the anhydrous compound "inherently results in at least trace amounts of" the claimed hemihydrate even if the prior art did not discuss or recognize the hemihydrate).

Examiner acknowledges the applicants' argument that Engman does not disclose a method of enhancing peroxidase activity of the enzyme, and a method of preventing peroxidation of a substance comprising combining thioredoxin, thioredoxin reductase and NADPH with a substrate.

Please note that in the reduction process, the reduced thioredoxin is useful for the conversion of hydrogen peroxide to water, which means it reduces the peroxide in the cell, with the help of thioredoxin peroxidase. More the substrate more production of reduced thioredoxin, which in turn enhances the peroxidase activity. The claims 15 and 16 have two substrates, viz., thioredoxin and selenium compound, which produces more reduced thioredoxin, which anticipates the enhancement of the peroxidase activity. Hence the claims 15-16, 18-19 and 27-28 are anticipated.

Examiner acknowledges the applicants' argument that Engman does not disclose a method of oxidizing reduced thioredoxin by a substrate, and a method for reducing a peroxide.

Thioredoxins are electron donors. The claims 17 and 18 comprises both thioredoxin and selenium compound in the enzymatic reaction. Both are substrates for the enzyme. The Km for thioredoxin is less than the selenium compound for the enzyme. In the assay, the unreacted selenium compound expected to oxidize the reduced thioredoxin. Hence the claims 17 and 18 are anticipated.